

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

KYNTREL TREVYONE JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

TIMOTHY M. THRASHER, et al.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:20-CV-5016-BHS-DWC

ORDER

Plaintiff moves for the Court to order Defendants to identify the Jane/John Doe Defendants #1 and #2. Dkt. 29. Plaintiff alleges Defendants have “refused to release their names.” Dkt. 29 at 1.

While the Court has the duty to serve the summons and complaint, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d), an IFP plaintiff still bears the burden of providing accurate and sufficient information to effect service. *See Walker v. Sumner*, 14 F.3d 1415 (9th Cir. 1994); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4. When an IFP plaintiff fails to provide the Court with accurate and sufficient information to effect service of the summons and complaint, it is appropriate for the Court to *sua sponte* dismiss the

1 unserved defendant. *Walker*, 14 F.3d at 1421-22 (quoting *Puett v. Blanford*, 912 F.2d 270, 275
2 (9th Cir. 1990), *abrogated on other grounds by Sandin v. Connor*, 515 U.S. 472 (1995)).

3 Aside from Plaintiff's blanket allegation Defendants have refused to provide the names of
4 the Doe Defendants, which is not supported by any additional factual allegations or support,
5 there is no indication Plaintiff has attempted to identify the Doe Defendants through the
6 discovery process. It remains Plaintiff's responsibility to provide sufficient information to effect
7 service. *See Walker*, 14 F.3d at 1421-22. Therefore, the Court recommends Plaintiff be ordered
8 to provide the names and addresses of Defendants John/Jane Doe on or before August 23, 2020.
9 If Plaintiff is unable to provide the Court with the names and addresses of Defendants John/Jane
10 Doe, the Court will recommend dismissal of Defendants John/Jane Doe from this case.

11 Dated this 23rd day of July, 2020.

12 
13

14 David W. Christel
United States Magistrate Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24